



---

## **Planning and Development Acts 2000 to 2018**

### **Planning Authority: Dublin City Council**

### **Amendments to the North Lotts and Grand Canal Dock SDZ Planning Scheme.**

**WHEREAS** on the 16<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2014, An Bord Pleanála decided, under section 169(7) of the Planning and Development Act, 2000, to approve, with modifications, the making of the North Lotts and Grand Canal Dock Strategic Development Zone Planning Scheme, and this scheme was subsequently published by Dublin City Council:

**AND WHEREAS** on the 8<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2017, Dublin City Council applied to An Bord Pleanála to make amendments, as set out in the document entitled “Proposed amendment to the North Lotts and Grand Canal Dock SDZ Planning Scheme in relation to revised bridge locations across the River Liffey”, submitted with the application:

**AND WHEREAS**, in arriving at its decision, the Board had regard to –

- the planning history of the Strategic Development Zone scheme approved by An Bord Pleanála in May 2014, and to the overall scope and objectives of the approved planning scheme,
- the nature of the proposed amendments, as set out in the Planning Report accompanying the application,

- the responses to public consultation, and the report of the consultation phase prepared by Dublin City Council,
- the Inspector's report dated November, 2017, and the Inspector's report dated October 2018, assessing the consultation response and advising on whether or not to make the amendments, and
- the provisions of section 170A of the Planning and Development Act, 2000, as amended:

**NOW THEREFORE** An Bord Pleanála decided, under the provisions of section 170(A) of the Planning and Development Act, 2000, as amended, to **APPROVE** the making of the proposed amendment to include the bridge proposed immediately west of the existing Tom Clarke (formerly East Link) Bridge, based on the Reasons and Considerations mark (1) set out below and **NOT TO APPROVE** the making of the proposed amendment involving the re-location of the bridges already included in the SDZ Planning Scheme, based on the Reasons and Considerations marked (2) set out below.

### **Resultant Changes to the SDZ Planning Scheme**

With reference to the proposed amendments set out in Appendix 1 of the application received by An Bord Pleanála on the 8<sup>th</sup> day of August 2017 (Pages 22 – 23), the following shall apply:

**Graphics:** Relevant figures and graphics to be updated to include the additional bridge location west of Tom Clarke bridge. Other proposed changes shall not apply.

**Text:** Proposed text changes shall not apply, with the exception of the proposed final entry (page 197): “New pedestrian/ cyclist bridge across River Liffey, positioned alongside the Tom Clarke Bridge (former ‘East Link’).”

## **REASONS AND CONSIDERATIONS (1)**

The Board was satisfied that the addition of a new pedestrian/cyclist bridge immediately west of the Tom Clarke (formerly East Link) bridge would be appropriate in order to provide improved safety and to provide better connectivity in this area. This bridge would be compatible with the improvements in connectivity offered by the proposed new Dodder bridge. The proposed amendment would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

## **REASONS AND CONSIDERATIONS (2)**

The approved Strategic Development Zone Planning Scheme includes new proposed bridges for pedestrians and cyclists at Forbes Street, and at Castleforbes Road.

In relation to the Forbes Street bridge, it is considered that the location of the bridge in the Planning Scheme is an appropriate location owing to its position on a clear desire line for pedestrians and cyclists between north and south of the River Liffey, directly linking Grand Canal Square and Spencer Dock (including the existing Luas red line stop) and in the longer term offering the potential of a direct connection from south of the river to a future Dart Underground commuter rail station at North Wall Quay. This location has greater potential to alleviate pedestrian and cycling congestion on the Samuel Beckett Bridge, compared with the proposed alternative location at Blood Stoney Road, which would not serve the pedestrian and cyclist desire lines as successfully. The Board considered that, notwithstanding the technical and cost arguments put forward in support of relocation, the existing approved position for the Forbes Street bridge would better serve the interests and amenities of the area in the long term, and would accord with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Furthermore, the Board did not consider that the proposed new bridge at Tom Clarke Bridge should necessarily replace the bridge included in the approved Planning Scheme at Castleforbes Road. It was considered that the Castleforbes Road crossing will in itself satisfy important desire lines for pedestrians and cyclists in the vicinity and the wider area, in tandem with the build-out and occupation of the eastern area of the Docklands. It was considered that this crossing ought not be removed as an objective from the Planning Scheme, in the interests of the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

In deciding not to accept the inspector's recommendation to make the amendment as applied for, the Board placed weight on achieving the optimal long-term configuration of bridge crossings serving the area, as set out in the Reasons and Considerations above.

### **Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Screening**

The Board noted submissions on file, including the planning report accompanying the application, submissions by observers following from public notices made by Dublin City Council, and the Report on Consultation Phase by Dublin City Council, which was accompanied by an SEA Screening Statement. The Board agreed with the conclusion of this document and with the screening assessment carried out by the Inspector (report dated 29<sup>th</sup> November 2017) in relation to the requirement for SEA. The Board was satisfied that, owing to the nature of the proposed amendment and the scope of the original SEA procedures already completed for the adopted scheme, the need for SEA does not arise in relation to the amendments proposed.

